

MASTER EQUATIONS AND MAJORANA SPINORS

G.W. GIBBONS

D.A.M.T.P.

University of Cambridge

Silver Street

Cambridge CB3 9EW

U.K.

February 7, 2008

ABSTRACT

I describe how the states of a discrete automata with p sites, each of which may be off or on, can be represented as Majorana spinors associated to a spacetime with signature (p, p) . Some ideas about the quantization of such systems are discussed and the relationship to some unconventional formulations and generalizations of quantum mechanics, particularly Jordan's spinorial quantum mechanics are pointed out. A connection is made to the problem of time and the complex numbers in quantum gravity.

Introduction

Andre Trautman has had, throughout his career, the happy knack of realizing long ahead of others what will ultimately turn out to be just the right language and concepts needed to most elegantly and economically encapsulate our emerging ideas about the physical world. Such languages must be both precise and universal, easily understood and yet sufficiently subtle as to suggest new avenues for exploration and exploitation. Often called geometrical, they may in fact incorporate profound algebraic insights as well.

I first became aware of Andre's talent for clear structured exposition of a physical theory on reading as a student his 1964 Brandeis Lectures, appropriately entitled "Foundations and Current Problems of General Relativity". A later notable example of his prescience was his insight that fibre-bundle theory would eventually prove to be an everyday tool for physicists. More recently he has been exploring the world of spinors and geometrical algebra. In this article I wish, among other things, to indicate how this might just turn out to be the appropriate language to describe such disparate subjects as the spread of forest fires, neural nets and the problem of memory or the development of avalanches, just as it has already shown its worth in statistical mechanics.

My own interest was first aroused by some ideas of 't Hooft's on cellular automata and quantum mechanics [1,2]. During a stay in Utrecht I tried to understand what was the connection between "spin models" and spinors which was so effectively exploited by Onsager 50 years ago in his solution of the Ising model. Since then I have been struck by how often the same ideas seem to crop up in many other areas of physics of which I have only a superficial knowledge. Strange analogues of quantum mechanics, quantum field theory and the Dirac equation seem to arise all over the place. Clearly there is something universal going on here. What follows is my attempt to understand what that might be. I do not claim that I am alone in realizing this connection (Dubois-Violette, for example, has described similar things [3]) but my emphasis on the essential reality (in the mathematical sense) of the construction and my attempts (in the final section) to relate the discussion to some ideas in quantum gravity is perhaps new. In any event I dedicate it to Andre hoping that he will find my exposition of interest and that it may perhaps provoke him to look further if he hasn't already done so.

1. Master Equations and Partition Functions

The common theme of many of the applications I alluded to is a Markov process in which the time development of a "probability vector" $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$ evolves according to a "Master Equation" of the form

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt} = \sum_{j \neq i} \left(-w_{ij}p_i + w_{ji}p_j \right) \quad (1.1)$$

$$= \sum_j w_{ji}p_j, \quad (1.2)$$

where the "transition rates" w_{ij} are positive and constrained by the requirement that

$$\sum_i p_i = 1, \quad (1.3)$$

so that for example

$$w_{11} = -w_{12} - w_{13} \dots - w_{1n}. \quad (1.4)$$

Geometrically speaking (1.3) tells us that the probability vector lies on the $(n-1)$ -simplex Σ_{n-1} in the positive orthant $\mathbb{R}_+^n$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ * satisfying

$$\mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{p} = 1 \quad (1.5)$$

where $\mathbf{i} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ is the un-normalized completely ignorant probability vector obtained by taking all *a priori* probabilities to be equal. The set of probability vectors, also called states, is convex. The extreme points of the state space Σ_{n-1} , may be called "pure states", and correspond to the vertices of the simplex, that is to the unit basis vectors $\mathbf{e}_i$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and the remaining, non-extreme states are called "mixed". Note that the language of pure and mixed states is as applicable to the classical systems being considered here as it is to quantum mechanical systems. Indeed according to one view point what makes the present set up classical is precisely the fact that the space of mixed states $\mathcal{M}$ is a simplex [4,5,6] and the space of pure states $\mathcal{P}$ are its vertices.

* By $\mathbb{R}^n$, I mean the standard n -dimensional vector space equipped with its positive definite inner product. I shall not, therefore, distinguish between vectors and covectors. All indices will therefore be lowered.

The solution of (1.1) may be written as as

$$p_i(t) = \exp(tw_{ij})p_j(0) \quad (1.6)$$

$$= \$_{ij}p_j(0), \quad (1.7)$$

where $\$ = \exp tw$ is a stochastic matrix, i.e a square matrix all of whose rows sum to unity.

The stationary, i.e time-independent, states, or equilibria have probabilities p_i^{equ} . In thermodynamic applications each pure state $\mathbf{e}_i$ is assigned an energy E_i one has at temperature $T = \beta^{-1}$,

$$p_i^{\text{equ}} = \exp(-\beta E_i)/Z(\beta) \quad (1.8)$$

where:

$$Z(\beta) = \sum_i \exp(-\beta E_i). \quad (1.9)$$

is the partition function. Given the energies E_i the challenge is to calculate the partition function $Z(\beta)$. This was achieved by Onsager [7] using Pauli matrices including the *pure imaginary* matrix σ_2 for the two-dimnsional lattice Ising model. I shall argue shortly that, despite appearances and as befits the purely classical nature of the problem, these spinorial techniques actually involve the *real*, i.e. Majorana spinors of a Kleinian spacetime with as many time coordinates as it has space coordinates.

More generally given an observable $\mathbf{O}$ which takes values O_n , its expectation value $\langle \mathbf{O} \rangle$ at time t is given by

$$\langle \mathbf{O} \rangle = \sum_i p_i O_i. \quad (1.10)$$

One may think of the classical (commuting) observables as matrices acting on $\mathbb{R}^n$ which happen to be diagonal in the basis provided by the pure states. One may then re-write (1.10) as

$$\langle \mathbf{O} \rangle = \mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{O} \mathbf{p}. \quad (1.11)$$

2 Quantizing Discrete Automata

I have already commented upon the superficial resemblance of this classical formalism to standard quantum mechanics. If we really were dealing with quantum mechanics, then the corresponding configuration space $\mathcal{Q}$ would be just the discrete set of n points $\mathcal{Q}_n = \{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ and the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ would be $L^2(\mathcal{Q}_n, \mathbb{C})$ which may think of as the standard n -dimensional Hermitean vector space $\mathbb{C}^n = \mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}$ with orthonormal basis given by $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$.

Thus even though the (*linear*) equation (1.2) is like the (*linear*) Schrödinger equation we face the difficulty that

- (i) The probability vector $\mathbf{p}$ has components which are real and positive.
- (ii) The probability vector $\mathbf{p}$ is normalized using the L^1 norm (1.4) rather than the usual L^2 norm,

One might consider, as does Wheeler in considering thesis topics [9], passing to real quantum mechanics [8] by taking a square root, i.e. introducing the vector

$$\psi = ((p_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}, (p_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \dots (p_n)^{\frac{1}{2}}). \quad (2.1)$$

The normalization condition (1.4) now tells us that ψ lies on the unit n -sphere $S^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. However now the equation of motion (1.2) becomes *non-linear*. Moreover there is some ambiguity in taking the square roots in (2.1). If we take them all to be positive we map the simplex Σ_{n-1} onto the positive orthant of the $(n-1)$ -sphere or projectively speaking, the interior of an $(n-1)$ -simplex sitting inside real projective space $\mathbb{RP}^{n-1}$. In real quantum mechanics one usually thinks of the pure states as all real vectors ψ except that one identifies those which differ by a non-zero real multiple. Thus the pure states roam all over $\mathbb{RP}^{n-1}$. To restrict them to a part of $\mathbb{RP}^{n-1}$ would in effect put a restriction on the Superposition Principle : only positive real combinations would be allowed.

The idea pursued by 't Hooft is different. He considers

- (i) The evolution to be reversible and time to be discrete
- (ii) Each site to be occupied with certainty.

Thus we have a classical reversible discrete automaton whose time evolution is given by iterating a permutation matrix $U : \mathcal{Q}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_n$ which permutes the basis elements

$\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$. After N steps we obtain U^N . Clearly U^N is a special case of an orthogonal matrix

$$U^N \subset SO(n; \mathbb{R}) \quad (2.2)$$

or indeed a unitary matrix

$$U^N \subset U(n; \mathbb{C}). \quad (2.3)$$

't Hooft's idea is to find a Hermitean matrix H such that

$$U^N = \exp(-iNH). \quad (2.4)$$

The Hermitean matrix H is to be thought of as the Hamiltonian of the quantum mechanical system associated to the original classical automaton.

Quite aside from the ambiguity in taking the logarithm in order to obtain H , there are two rather puzzling things about this.

- (i) Usually we only consider classical first order equations governing the motion in classical state space or phase space $\mathcal{P}$ which is even dimensional. The motion in configuration space $\mathcal{Q}$ is usual governed by second order equations. Thus we might have tried to identify $\mathcal{P}$ with the discrete set of states $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$.
- (ii) Usually the quantum mechanical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is not given by $L^2(\mathcal{P})$, rather one seeks a prescription (e.g a "polarization") for cutting $L^2(\mathcal{P})$ down to a Hilbert space of functions depending upon half as many variables. The standard continuous case is of course when the phase space is the tangent bundle of the configuration space $\mathcal{P} = T^*(\mathcal{Q})$.

This suggests to me that one should restrict attention to the case when the number of discrete states n is even. One could then seek to embed the time evolution operator in $U(\frac{n}{2}; \mathbb{C})$,

$$U^N \subset U(\frac{n}{2}; \mathbb{C}). \quad (2.5)$$

In other words one should try to endow the original real vector space $\mathbb{R}^n$ with a complex structure J thus allowing us to regard it as $\mathbb{C}^{\frac{n}{2}}$. Acting on the states one would have:

$$\mathbf{e}_i \rightarrow J(\mathbf{e}_i) \quad (2.6)$$

such that $J^2 = -1$ and moreover one would require that this action commutes with the time evolution:

$$UJ - JU = 0. \quad (2.7)$$

The complex structure J would then play the analogous role to that of a "polarization" in the geometrical quantization of a symplectic manifold.

An interesting and different example where one passes from a classical to a quantum description of a discrete system arises in the theory of quantum computation [11]. Classically a single bit of information is carried by two-state system. Quantum mechanically a qbit is carried by a two-state quantum system. However in that case it is physically more realistic to think of the classical two state system arising from the quantum-mechanical two-state system in the limit that all quantum coherence is lost rather than thinking of the quantum system as arising from the "quantization of the classical system". Thus classically one has a 2×2 diagonal density matrix whose entries are $p_{\downarrow}$ and $+p_{\uparrow}$ say. Thus the remarks of the last paragraph do not apply.

3 Site Models

So far I have said nothing about what the probabilities p_i are supposed to be for. Moreover the systems we have considered have no "spatial" structure and so notions like locality are not defined. In many applications one considers a certain number, p of sites which may be occupied or not. Typical examples are "classical spins" which may be "up" or "down" in the Ising model or trees in a forest which may be either "green" or "burnt out". The total number of pure states n is therefore 2^p . This is exactly the dimension of the Grassmann algebra $\Lambda^*(\mathbb{R}^p)$ over $\mathbb{R}^p$ and the connection arises as follows. We have

$$\Lambda^*(\mathbb{R}^p) = \sum_{q=0}^{q=p} \oplus \Lambda^q(\mathbb{R}^p). \quad (3.1)$$

where $\Lambda^q(\mathbb{R}^p)$ are the q -forms on $\mathbb{R}^p$. The space of q -forms is spanned by the simple q -forms. These correspond to the q -planes through the origin of $\mathbb{R}^p$ which contain q distinct basis vectors. There are $\frac{p!}{q!(p-q)!}$ of these and they correspond to the ways of choosing q occupied sites. Thus for example $\Lambda^0(\mathbb{R}^p) \equiv \mathbb{R}$ corresponds to no sites being occupied and $\Lambda^p(\mathbb{R}^p) \equiv \mathbb{R}$ corresponds to all sites being occupied. Hodge duality acting on $\Lambda^*(\mathbb{R}^p)$ reverses the state of occupation of the sites.

Thus if we think of a single site $\mathbf{e}_1$ and $p_{\downarrow}$ is the probability of it being empty and $p_{\uparrow}$ is the probability of it being full we have the probability vector

$$\mathbf{p} = p_{\downarrow} + p_{\uparrow} \mathbf{e}_1. \quad (3.2)$$

If two sites are involved we have

$$\mathbf{p} = p_{\downarrow\downarrow} + p_{\uparrow\downarrow}\mathbf{e}_1 + p_{\downarrow\uparrow}\mathbf{e}_2 + p_{\uparrow\uparrow}\mathbf{e}_1 \wedge \mathbf{e}_2. \quad (3.3)$$

As an example one could take Empedocles's theory of the four elements, fire, earth, air and water based on the two pairs of contrary attributes hot/cold and dry/wet. Ramon Lull's *Ars Magna* [10] is essentially the generalization to more than two sites.

These last two examples look, on the face of it, neither quantum mechanical nor spinorial but let's define real creation and annihilation operators a_a and $a_a^\dagger$ where the index a taken from the beginning of the latin alphabet run from 1 to p by their action on a general probability vector $\mathbf{p} \in \Lambda^*(\mathbb{R}^p)$ by

$$a_a^\dagger \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{e}_a \wedge \mathbf{p} \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$a_a \mathbf{p} = i_{\mathbf{e}_a} \mathbf{p}, \quad (3.5)$$

where $\wedge$ is the exterior product and i denotes the interior product. It follows that

$$a_a^\dagger a_b + a_b a_a^\dagger = \delta_{ab} \quad (3.6)$$

$$a_a^\dagger a_b^\dagger + a_b^\dagger a_a^\dagger = 0 \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$a_a a_b + a_b a_a = 0. \quad (3.8)$$

In fact it is straightforward to check that, with respect to the euclidean inner product induced on $\Lambda^*(\mathbb{R}^p)$ from the euclidean inner product on $\mathbb{R}^p$, that a_a and $a_a^\dagger$ are adjoints or in the natural basis transposes:

$$a_a^\dagger = (a_a)^t. \quad (3.9)$$

If one changes basis by introducing

$$\gamma_{\pm a} = a_a \pm a_a^\dagger \quad (3.10)$$

one has

$$\gamma_{\pm a} \gamma_{\pm b} + \gamma_{\pm b} \gamma_{\pm a} = \pm 2\delta_{ab} \quad (3.11)$$

and

$$\gamma_{+a}\gamma_{-b} + \gamma_{-b}\gamma_{+a} = 0 \quad (3.12)$$

Thus one sees that the annihilation and creation operators $\{a_a, a_a^\dagger\}$ generate the real Clifford algebra

$$\text{Cliff}(\mathbb{R}^{p,p}) \equiv \mathbb{R}(2^p)$$

where $\mathbb{R}(2^p)$ is the algebra of real $2^p \times 2^p$ matrices. In other words we may think of the probability vectors $\mathbf{p}$ as being Majorana spinors for $SO(p, p; \mathbb{R})$, hence my title. The space of mixed states $\mathcal{M}$ is thus the set of Majorana spinors whose components are non-negative and which sum to unity. The set of pure states $\mathcal{P}$ are those spinors with one non-vanishing component equal to unity. Unfortunately they do not in general correspond to what are called "pure spinors".

Note that the Clifford group itself is the general linear group $GL(2^p; \mathbb{R})$. The annihilation and creation operators $\{a_a, a_a^\dagger\}$ themselves are associated with lightlike directions. The volume element $\eta \in \Lambda^p(\mathbb{R})$ is given by

$$\eta = \prod_{a=1}^{a=p} (1 - 2a_a^\dagger a_a). \quad (3.13)$$

Thus $\eta = 1$ for states with an even number of occupied sites and $\eta = -1$ for states with an odd number of occupied sites. It follows that the direct sum decomposition:

$$\Lambda^*(\mathbb{R}^p) = \Lambda^{\text{even}}(\mathbb{R}^p) \oplus \Lambda^{\text{odd}}(\mathbb{R}^p) \quad (3.15)$$

corresponds to the direct sum decomposition of the space of Majorana spinors into Weyl and anti-Weyl spinors. Weyl spinors have an even number of occupied sites and anti-Weyl spinors an odd number of occupied sites.

Spinors, the Light Cone and Jordan Quantum Mechanics

In view of the connection emphasised by Penrose between 2-component Weyl spinors of $SO(3, 1)$, the lightcone of four-dimensional Minkowski spacetime and the quantum mechanics of spin. It seems appropriate, while considering quantum mechanics and spinors, to recall a generalization of the usual quantum mechanical formalism due to Jordan which dispenses with wave functions and takes density matrices as being fundamental. As remarked by Townsend, [12] this is especially intriguing because of Hawking's well known suggestion that quantum coherence may be lost in quantum gravity due to black hole effects. Jordan requires of his "observables" ρ they satisfy the axioms of a real commutative but non-associative algebra $\mathcal{A} = \{\rho, \bullet\}$ now called a Jordan Algebra. The irreducible finite-dimensional algebras were classified by Jordan, von Neuman and Wigner [13]. There are four series and one exceptional case:

- (i) $J(\mathbb{R}^n)$
- (ii) $H_n^{\mathbb{R}}$
- (iii) $H_n^{\mathbb{C}}$
- (iv) $H_n^{\mathbb{H}}$
- (v) $H_3^{\mathbb{O}}$

Of these $H_n^{\mathbb{R}}, H_n^{\mathbb{C}}, H_n^{\mathbb{H}}$ consist of $n \times n$ real symmetric, Hermitean and quaternionic Hermitean matrices respectively, corresponding to quantum mechanics over the fields $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{H}$ for which the product $\bullet$ is given by

$$\rho_1 \bullet \rho_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\rho_1 \rho_2 + \rho_2 \rho_1). \quad (4.1)$$

The exceptional case $H_3^{\mathbb{O}}$ is related to 3×3 the octonionic matrices. The $(n+1)$ -dimensional sequence $J(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is based on Clifford multiplication associated to $\mathbb{R}^n$. If $\{1, \gamma_i\}$ is an orthonormal basis for the Clifford algebra $\text{Cliff}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ a general mixed state may be written as

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(x_0 + x_i \gamma_i) \quad (4.2)$$

and the Jordan product satisfies

$$\gamma_i \bullet \gamma_j = \delta_{ij}. \quad (4.3)$$

Note that the non-associative algebra $J(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is not a subalgebra of associative algebra $\text{Cliff}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ because they use a different multiplication law. However given a matrix representation of the Clifford algebra one obtains a matrix representation of the Jordan algebra using (4.1).

Note that as algebra's Jordan algebras are necessarily real and indeed one may regard this as a part of the motivation: to deal only with real observables quantities. However it may happen of course that the spinorial Jordan algebras $J(\mathbb{R}^n)$ based on the real Clifford algebra $\text{Cliff}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are isomorphic to algebras of complex valued matrices. Whether or not this is true depends upon the dimension n . This happens for the case $n = 3$, which may be said in some way to account for the success of complex methods in four-dimensional general relativity.

Let us return to the interpretation of spinorial Jordan algebras. If $n_i = \frac{x_i}{(x_k x_k)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ then provided one sets $x_0 = 1$ every non-trivial mixed state ρ may be expressed uniquely in terms of two pure states which are associated to two primitive idempotents or projection operators $E_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm n_i \gamma_i)$

$$\rho = pE_+ + (1 - p)E_- . \quad (4.4)$$

The idempotents $E^{\pm}$ satisfy

$$E_{\pm}^2 = E_{\pm} . \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$E_{\pm} \bullet E_{\mp} = 0 . \quad (4.6)$$

Since $|x| = |p - \frac{1}{2}|$, and one wishes to interpret p as a probability to be in the pure state associated to E_+ , observables are confined to lie within or on the surface of a ball of unit *diameter* in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The mixed states $\mathcal{M}$ lie in the interior and the pure states $\mathcal{P}$, which correspond to idempotents of the algebra, lie on the unit $(n - 1)$ sphere.

$$x_i x_i = 1 . \quad (4.7)$$

Geometrically speaking, a general mixed state lies on a unique diameter of the ball. The ends of which are the pure states. The probabilities to be in the two pure states are given by the distances to the endpoints of the diameter.

Clearly we may think of the set of pure states of the Jordan algebra $J(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as the light cone of $(n + 1)$ -dimensional Minkowski spacetime $\mathbb{R}^{n,1}$. There are four special cases:

- (i) $J(\mathbb{R}) \equiv \text{Cliff}(\mathbb{R}) \equiv \mathbb{E} \equiv \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$,
- (ii) $J(\mathbb{R}^2) \equiv H_2^{\mathbb{R}}$,
- (iii) $J(\mathbb{R}^3) \equiv H_2^{\mathbb{C}}$,
- (iv) $J(\mathbb{R}^5) \equiv H_2^{\mathbb{C}}$.

Case (i) is that of a single a classical spin. The symbol $\mathbb{E}$ denotes the double or hypercomplex numbers. As an algebra it is reducible. The space of pure states is $S^0 \equiv \mathbb{Z}_2$.

Case (iii) coincides with the smallest possible non-trivial standard quantum mechanical system having just two states with Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^2$. The space of pure states is $S^2 \equiv \mathbb{CP}^1$.

Case (ii) is the real quantum mechanical version of this with Hilbert space $\mathbb{R}^2$. The space of pure states is $S^1 \equiv \mathbb{RP}^1$.

Case (iv) corresponds to quaternionic quantum mechanics with Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}^2$. The space of pure states is $S^4 \equiv \mathbb{HP}^1$.

The other cases differ radically from standard quantum, or non-standard mechanics. In general there is no simple correspondence between light rays or pure states and spinors and the spinors are not in general Majorana. However, as we shall see shortly, one may also discuss master equations in the context of spinorial Jordan mechanics.

It is convenient to consider only observables which have no component along the direction of the unit matrix. Then, up to scale, they may be identified with points on the sphere with unit diameter.

If we have a matrix representation we may express the expectation value of an observable a in a state ρ as

$$\langle a \rangle = \frac{2}{\nu} \text{Tr} \rho a = 2a_i x_i, \quad (4.7.)$$

where ν is the dimension of the representation of the Clifford algebra, i.e. $2^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}$. We may write the expectation value as

$$\langle a \rangle = p(a_i n_i) + (1 - p)(-a_i n_i), \quad (4.8)$$

where p and $1 - p$ are the probabilities of being in the two pure states at the two ends $\pm n_i$ of the diameter whose direction is given by the unit vector n_i .

We can associate an observable a with the real function $a(y) = 2a_i y_i$ on the $(n-1)$ sphere of points $\{y_i | y_k y_k = \frac{1}{4}\}$. Similarly the mixed state ρ gives rise to the non-negative function $P(y) = 1 + 4x_i y_i$ with mean value 1. One may then interpret $P(y)$ as a sort of classical probability distribution and we have

$$\langle a \rangle = \frac{n}{2} \int_{S^{n-1}} \mu \rho(y) a(y) / \int_{S^{n-1}} \mu, \quad (4.9.)$$

where μ is the volume element on the $(n-1)$ -sphere of radius $\frac{1}{2}$. If $n = 2$ the probability distribution interpretation is consistent. It is a special case of the general quantum mechanical discussion on $\mathbb{CP}^n$ [14].

The difficulty with spinorial Jordan mechanics emphasised by Townsend is the introduction of the analogue of a Shrödinger equation. In standard quantum mechanics, just as in classical mechanics, every observable generates a flow on the space $\mathcal{P}$ of pure states which extends to a flow on the space of mixed states $\mathcal{M}$. One may alternatively postulate, particularly in the case of open systems, that the fundamental equation of motion is a generalized master equation or flow on the space of mixed states $\mathcal{M}$ which need not necessarily be induced from a flow on the pure states. This is essentially Hawking's viewpoint: he takes $\mathcal{M} = H_n^{\mathbb{C}}$, the space of density matrices in standard quantum mechanics. The finite (or infinite) time transformations correspond to his linear \$ map called the super-scattering matrix:

$$\rho \rightarrow \$\rho. \quad (4.10)$$

One says that the \$ matrix factorizes if this map may be written as

$$\rho \rightarrow S\rho S^\dagger \quad (4.11)$$

for a unitary S -matrix $S \in U(n; \mathbb{C})$. Note that that if one wishes to retain the usual interpretation of probabilities relating them to the proportions of the outcomes of independent experiments one must have a *linear* master equation.

In the case of the standard time evolution for finite dimensional quantum mechanical systems with n states one uses the fact that $\mathcal{P} \equiv \mathbb{CP}^{n-1}$ is a symplectic manifold and the flow is Hamiltonian. The set of observables generate the group $U(n; \mathbb{C})$ which acts transitively on $\mathbb{CP}^{n-1}$. In the case of spinorial Jordan mechanics an observable a certainly gives rise to real valued function (i.e. $a_i x_i$) but $\mathcal{P} \equiv S^n$ is

only symplectic for $n = 2$. One way to get a flow would be to take the gradient flow with respect to the round metric on S^{n-1} . Each such function is a conformal Killing potential and so would generate a one parameter subgroup of the conformal isometries of S^{n-1} . However these do not act linearly on the space of mixed states $\mathcal{M} \equiv B^n$. It seems therefore that in spinorial Jordan mechanics one must give up the idea that a single observables can generate the dynamics.

An alternative approach to finding an equation of motion is to use two observables a and b [12]. The analogue of the Heisenberg equations of motion for a density matrix ρ is then taken to be

$$\dot{\rho} + \{a, \rho, b\} = 0, \quad (4.12)$$

where the *associator* of the three elements $\{a, \rho, b\}$ is defined by

$$\{a, \rho, b\} = (a \bullet \rho) \bullet b - a \bullet (\rho \bullet b). \quad (4.13)$$

If a, ρ, b are matrices one has

$$\{a, \rho, b\} = \frac{1}{4} [[b, a], \rho], \quad (4.14)$$

where $[b, a]$ is the ordinary matrix commutator. In ordinary quantum mechanics we can always find a and b such that the Hamiltonian H satisfies

$$H = \frac{i}{4} [a, b] \quad (4.15)$$

and so (4.12) reduces to Heisenberg's equation:

$$\dot{\rho} + i[H, \rho] = 0. \quad (.10)$$

A simple calculation shows that (4.12) becomes in components

$$\dot{x}_i = (b_i a_j - a_i b_j) x_j \quad (4.17)$$

This is just a rotation in the 2-plane spanned by the n -vectors whose components are a_i and b_i . It certainly does not correspond to a gradient flow. However if (4.12) is generalized to include a sum of associators of pairs of elements one would obtain a general element of $so(n; \mathbb{R})$. Thus in spinorial Jordan mechanics the natural time

evolution law seems corresponds to rigid rotations of the space $\mathcal{P} \equiv S^{n-1}$ of pure states.

Following Hawking one might introduce a linear map $\$: B^n \rightarrow B^n$ which fixes the totally ignorant state $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$, i.e which fixes the origin. Such maps would be the product of a purity preserving rotation combined with a purity reducing contraction. The invertible $\$$ maps then would be the rotations generated as above.

The conclusion seems to be that in general Jordan's algebraic formulation of Quantum Mechanics, in particular the spinorial version, fails the test of providing a satisfactory time evolution law unless it coincides with the conventional case.

Conclusion

What I have attempted to do in this article is to show that spinorial techniques using or Majorana spinors provide a convenient language for describing discrete classical systems such as discrete or cellular automata. The observation that spinor techniques may be useful is itself is not new. However what is often not greatly stressed is that one only needs *real* numbers. Complex numbers only come in when one considers quantum systems and their introduction is not as completely trivial as is sometimes supposed. In conventional quantum mechanics the complex numbers are needed when considering time evolution. This problem of introducing a time function and a complex structure into quantum mechanics becomes especially acute in quantum cosmology [15,16] where the consensus appears to be moving towards the idea that *both* are approximate concepts.

It is therefore of interest to see what form this problem takes in generalizations of conventional quantum mechanics. An illuminating example is provided by Jordan's spinorial algebraic version of quantum mechanics. We found that although there is a striking connection between the light cone of $n+1$ -dimensional Minkowski spacetime and spinors. the enterprise founders on the problem of time evolution unless it coincides with the orthodox spin $\frac{1}{2}$ quantum case. However, as I have argued elsewhere [15,16], this does not necessarily mean that the complex numbers of the spin group $Spin(3,1) \cong SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ are to be identified with the complex numbers of quantum mechanics. Indeed one could formulate all of classical physics in terms of Majorana spinors and still have to introduce complex numbers to pass to the quantum theory [15,17]. Whilst they are undoubtedly useful, Weyl spinors are in no way obligatory.

References

- [1] G 't Hooft *J Stat Phys* **53** (1988) 323-344
- [2] G 't Hooft *Nucl Phys* **B 342** (1990) 471-485
- [3] M Dubois-Violette : Complex structures and the Elie Cartan approach to the theory of Spinors in *Spinors, Twistors, Clifford Algebras and Quantum Deformations* eds. Z. Oziewicz et al., Kluwer, Amsterdam (1993)
- [4] B Mielnik *Commun Math Phys* **9** (1968) 55-80
- [5] B Mielnik *Commun Math Phys* **15** (1969) 1-46
- [6] B Mielnik *Commun Math Phys* **37** (1974) 221-256
- [7] L Onsager *Phys Rev* **65** (1944) 117-147
- [8] E C G Stueckelberg *Helv Phys Acta* **33** (1960) 727-752
- [9] J A Wheeler in *Directions in General Relativity: vol I* edited by B L Hu, M P Ryan and C V Visveshwara, Cambridge University Press (1993)
- [10] M Gardner *Logic Machine, Diagrams and Boolean Algebra* Dover Publications, New York (1968)
- [11] D Deutsch *Proc R Soc Lond* **A 400** (1985) 97-117
- [12] P K Townsend, The Jordan Formulation of Quantum Mechaincs in *Supersymmetry, Supergravity and Related Topics* edied by F del Aguila, J A Azcárraga and L E Ibáñez, World Scientific (1985)
- [13] P Jordan, J v Neuman and E Wigner *Annals of Mathematics* **35** (1934) 29-64
- [14] G W Gibbons *J Geom and Phys* **8** 147–162 (1992)
- [15] G W Gibbons and H-J Pohle *Nucl. Phys.* **B 410** 117-142 (1993)
- [16] G W Gibbons *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **D 3** 61-70 (1994)
- [17] G W Gibbons The Kummer Configuration and the Geometry of Majorana Spinors in *Spinors, Twistors, Clifford Algebras and Quantum Deformations* eds. Z. Oziewicz et al., Kluwer, Amsterdam (1993)